

Meeting Notes

11 June 2008

Location: Douglas County Land and Transportation Services 140 19th St., East Wenatchee (09:00-16:00).

For more info contact: Casey Baldwin 509-664-3148 baldwcomb@dfw.wa.gov

Welcome, introductions, purpose, review agenda

Casey opened the meeting at 9:05 a.m. with a round of introductions. Casey covered a few housekeeping items and other logistics for the meeting, particularly on keeping to the timeline in order to provide everyone the same amount of time and stay on schedule. Casey briefly went over the process and how this workshop fits in with the upcoming events such as project tours and final proposal review.

Casey reviewed the agenda and offered that project sponsors could switch the order of the projects they were to present, as long as the timing did not effect other project sponsors. He also suggested that the RTT wanted to finalize the dates for the project tours during the week of June 23. They are interested in shifting things so that the tours occur Mon-Wed since there are no projects to see in Okanogan on Monday. This will allow a greater number of RTT members and the SRFB tech panel members to see all the projects. This will involve moving the Wenatchee project tours to either Monday or Tuesday. Derek and Casey will work with the Lead Entity coordinators to see if that will work out.

1. Entiat River Assessment RM 6.8-16 and RM 26-34 (CCD)

Mike Rickel presented the project, clarifying that it was not just for the Upper Entiat, but for 2 sections of the Entiat including river mile 6.8-16, and 26-34.

Casey: confused how this tied into the other assessments. In a couple of places in the proposal, it indicates RM 0-34. The proposal will need to be absolutely clear which reaches this assessment will cover and how it overlaps (or does not overlap) with the other assessments that have occurred or are currently proposed.

Steve Kolk and Mike Rickel provided clarification on the reaches that will be covered by the Bureau of Reclamation and this proposal, respectively. Together, they total 34 miles.

Chuck: a brief explanation in the project summary would help clarify this.

Tom K: Why isn't the BOR covering the rest of the reach?

Mike R: The BOR is looking to do a higher-level assessment, and this proposal will provide that finer scale. It is really just too much work for one entity to conduct alone.

Tracy: what will this give us beyond what has already been done with respect to Limiting Factors?

Mike R: this provides more site-specific detail for selecting specific projects.

Casey: Task 2 needs more detail so its clear how this will be different from what is in all the planning documents.

John A: can you give me a sense of the timing for these assessments?

Mike R: the BOR will have a draft completed this fall, which will be used to complete the finer scale.

Kate: How far towards a project design?

Mike: These assessments will get us to 30% conceptual design.

Marc D: as defined by the SRFB manual?

Mike R: we will have more detail on specific sites, which will likely lead to a suite of projects.

Casey: Will the REI be to collect new data or just to assimilate data already available into the REI format?

Mike: The REI assessment will include extensive field data collection.

Steve H: over 50% of this is the hydrologic modeling. At what level of detail are you expecting to get results from this modeling?

Mike R: I am working with the consultant to understand the level of detail that the 2-D model will generate.

Carmen: the proposal says that a 2-d model will be developed, but if you have a model already in house, then you might build on that.

Steve: so the bulk of the cost is in collecting the field data to run the model?

Mike R: yes.

2. Conservation Opportunities on Icicle Creek (CDLT)

Bob Bugert presented the proposal to the RTT and Tributary members.

Kate: why are you only pursuing Tributary Fund for this?

Bob: we put a request into the Icicle Fund, and just found out that we passed that review. We will be receiving \$16/acre/year in perpetuity to manage the properties. Primarily that is for lands we own. There is another match secured from the Trust for Public Land.

Kate: when you finalize your proposal, are you going to have the management/stewardship plans completed for the easements?

Bob: that is our hope for these properties.

Kate: it is important for the RTT to know what sort of specific protections and restrictions will be on the property in order to assess the benefit of the project.

Joe K: are there no current restrictions in Chelan County as far as development is concerned on these properties? Is there any amount of protection from development along the creek (since they are in the floodplain)?

Kate: there are some restrictions in place, and houses are supposed to be 1 ft outside the 100 year floodplain.

Bob: The landowners have saved some areas that they plan to build in. Several lots may be excluded from the easement for home sites at the end of Wilson Rd.

Casey: in the final proposal, it would help to know where the 100 yr floodplain is and where potential development may go in, that will help us assess risks and potential benefits. If you can determine the number of potential home sites with and without the easement that would be best.

Kate: also identify fish use in this reach.

Steve: do you know if grazing will continue in this area?

Bob: pretty sure that it will continue, but the stewardship funds will help us actively manage those lands.

John: you talked about potential development on the West side of the street. How big is that?

Bob: it is for the family themselves. Depending on how much the family decides to keep, the easement will be between 115-165 acres.

Marc: these details will have to be worked out before the property will be appraised.

3. Goodfellow-Chotzen Floodplain Reconnection Project (CCNRD) presented by Mark Indrebro of the Watershed Company.

This was previously reviewed by the RTT as the Wenatchee River Side Channel project (CMZ site 2).

Joe K: the berm is man made?

Mark: (Yes).

Joe K: when it is removed, you're hoping the water will mostly stay in the side channel?

Mark: That's correct. We will use the backwater for high water flows.

Tracy: are there going to be any depressions or pools after you breach the berm that will hold fish (stranded) when it empties? Will there be some standing pools in the flood channel area? You may want to address the issue of fish stranding in the final proposal.

John: can you point out the slough?

Mark: the slough is the existing sidechannel.

Carmen: the landowners who step up and want to do these kinds of projects should be commended. You previously mentioned placement of wood in the side channel. You many want to design in some bigger more complex log structures.

Casey: you may want to add more detail on that, because when I read it, I understood it to be log placement, as opposed to engineered logjams. Not absolutely sure what the appropriate density is, but your budgeted to have a log every 7-10 feet. Also need to include the life expectancy of the log structures.

Carmen: thought I heard you saying you would not be digging the back channel down to intercept ground water. Suggest that you don't need a lot of that excavation, because it will find its own depth once you put structure in there.

Kate: in the lower section, how low will you need to go?

John: can you put in the final proposal the quantity of material you will be removing?

Casey: in project summary, you say it "utilizes" natural processes to restore floodplain function. In reality, your proposing to use heavy equipment to recapture a disconnected floodplain, then allowing natural processes to take over. In the previous RTT review we suggested not conducting any additional structures or excavation beyond simply removing the berm and let natural processes occur for a couple of years.

Chuck: This is also not spring Chinook or bull trout spawning area.

Tom K: do you have temperature data on the side channel?
Joy can help find this data.

Kate: why are you asking for funding for a section 106 permit when you already have one?

4. Kahler Complexity, Nason Creek (CCNRD): Presented by Joy Juelson (CCNRD) and Martin Fisher (Jones and Stokes).

Their current conceptual design is 5 structures with 5-7 logs each that will hopefully trap other wood as it moves through Nason Creek naturally.

Chuck: it might push energy in an unexpected direction and accelerate erosion under the power line.

Kate: have you talked to BPA about the evulsion and enhancing natural processes at this site?

Martin: yes, they signed the Landowner form and were informed of the project because they have a right of way.

There was some confusion about the future technical review of these designs, but the proposal suggested that the RTT would be included. Steve Kolk thought that would be covered through the ID team. Casey clarified that future review by the RTT would need to go through the RTT "request for review" process.

There was some concern over the timing of the installation with respect to spring Chinook spawning (early August to early Sept).

Be sure it does not discourage natural channel migration.

Steve H: are there issues or risks to downstream landowners?

Russell: What is the goal? It looks good, but what are your long-term goals and objectives? You need more details on what you expect from it.

Martin: We want to enhance what is there.

Chuck: You may just need to portray it differently.

John: Figure 3 riprap, is it existing or are you adding it?

Martin: Its existing, BPA put it there.

Steve: suggested showing a pre-1990 photo because this area has changed a lot in the last 20 years and it would be helpful to see how dynamic it is.

5. Rayrock Springs, Nason Creek (CCNRD)

Martin Fisher presented to the RTT and Trib Committee.

Joe: was the log cabled originally by the DOT?

Bob Steele: originally cabled by DOT and a deflector failed so there was a lot of pressure on that bank. Since a jam released, the pressure has subsided but there is now a lot of sediment build up.

Carmen: do you have LiDAR in this section? It would help to see the elevations in the forested area opposite the highway.

Martin: we do have it for this reach. By the time of the full application, we'll have some survey cross-sections to supplement the LiDAR data. This will show a nice topographic view of what is out there.

Carmen: are you interested in placing structures to kick the flow back into those other channels if you have access to those properties?

Martin: yes, we want to add some wiggle back into the Creek, but we have not really determined if it should be a small wiggle within the existing channel or adding sinuosity by pushing the creek into the opposite floodplain.

Casey: this project site is in a project area of the BOR assessment that was more disconnected from the floodplain and CMZ (relative to Kahler complexity). When the RTT conducted the biological benefit, we said that the first priority would be to access sidechannels and floodplain, not diversity/complexity projects. In the final proposal, you will want to address why diversity is being addressed in this particular reach, when the project area is still 36% disconnected from its floodplain and historic channel migration zone.

Martin: the ID Team site visit investigated floodplain channel access. The floodplain is pretty well accessed now, so the focus was on diversity.

Casey: But that is only at this site, there are areas upstream and down within this project area (as defined by USBR) that are disconnected, so you need to justify why you are not working on those projects and show that your work at this site will not forgo those higher priorities.

Tracy: Where are you planning to put structures? Thinking about putting in some wiggle before structures is a good thing. However, since the energy is running up against the road, it actually creates a scour pool, which juvenile fish will use, particularly when there is wood included. Since you can't move it away from the road, putting wood against the road where there is energy is good, and then deflectors elsewhere to move the water away.

John A: having a hard time grasping what is specifically being proposed at this site. Will the project just produce a design or will it include implementation?

Martin: by the time of the full application, we will have a better idea of the specific actions. The project will then implement the actions.

Keely: on p4, says these projects are outside the reach process, but will complement rather than change the reach strategy. What does this mean?

Joy: these were projects that were identified through the HSC process that could proceed regardless of the result of the prioritization of the tributary assessment work.

Other RTT members agreed that more clarification was needed on that statement. (it relates back to Casey's comment regarding the sequencing and the RTT biological benefit assessment for Nason Creek).

What is the life expectancy of the structures? What flow levels are they predicted to withstand?

6. Cashmere Ponds Off-Channel Habitat Project (CCNRD)

Bruce Heiner presented to the RTT and Trib Committee.

Kate: your proposal says 10ft of excavation, is that below the current level?

Bruce: The excavated channel will cause the pond level to drop a couple of feet, then we want 10 ft of depth in the pond below that.

Russell: do you have any stream temperature information on this project? Is the intent of the 1600 ft channel for enhanced habitat or just a way out of the pond?

Bruce: one is the habitat, but another is to get the year round connection to the river. We will maximize the habitat in the channel by putting a lot of wood into it.

Kate: concerned that if you go the full 1600 feet you will destabilize the riparian area of that floodplain. This is a functioning floodplain so less disturbance might be better.

Bruce: that is a valid concern. We will use the spoils from the excavation to stabilize the road prism.

Bob S: we will also replant native vegetation likely from cuttings on site.

John A: any information on predator use of these structures?

Tracy: bass are not an issue here. There are some pike minnow and possibly residual steelhead and avian predators (mergansers and blue herons). The island might make herons more effective.

Bruce: we will be putting quite a bit of fish cover in there, so depth and cover should offer refuge.

Casey: is DOT transferring the property to WDFW? That would be good thing to highlight in the final application, it could be included as a combination protection/restoration.

Bruce: we are in the process of figuring that out right now.

John A: in the proposal, would it be possible for you to quantify the existing situation with respect to mortality?

Bruce: we will look at the available information to see what can be quantified.

Bob S: we are just now starting to look at developing quantifiable data. Right now, we know that fish get trapped, but can not quantify how many or what their fate is.

Kate: you should coordinate with the city of Cashmere to extend there River Walk and include an I and E component in the project.

7. North Road Culvert Replacement (CCNRD)

Alan Schmidt presented to the RTT and Trib Committee.

Chuck: there aren't any bull trout up there now.

Casey: the proposal claims it will provide access to 7 miles of habitat but needs to specify if that is with or without fixing the other 12 barriers?

Alan: yes, we are working with USFWS and BPA on completing those others.

Casey: you will want to provide that additional clarification in the final proposal.

Tracy: What is the habitat condition within those 7 miles?

Bob S: on the whole, the Chumstick has very good habitat, productive, good riparian conditions.

Casey: on p5, extensive paragraph on spring Chinook life history in the Wenatchee basin. Suggest that this may not be necessary in the final proposal. Just include how you think Chinook will benefit from the action.

Kate: may want to tie in the possibility of Coho use.

Ken B: fish-friendly structure implies that you haven't determined what type of structure yet, but the proposal includes a bridge.

Alan: it will be a bridge.

Ken B: Be sure to say that in the proposal so its clear your not evaluating other options.

Joe M: is this SRFB only?

Joy: yes, it's a match from the existing source of funding.

Joe K: do you know how long the culvert has been there?

Kate: since 1957.

Casey: The ISRP response section was awkward. I recommend not trying to estimate carrying capacity of a watershed for a barrier proposal. Estimating carrying capacity is not very straightforward and its species specific. If you were to do it, I would not recommend using bank full width as your stream width area multiplier. Other RTT members agreed that estimating carrying capacity is beyond the purview of a proposal such as this.

Kate: you should define in the budget which portion is for the culvert/habitat work and which portion is for the adjoining road work, since this project goes beyond replacing the culvert.

8. Twisp River Riparian Protection (Methow Conservancy)

Julie Grialou presented to the RTT and Trib Committee.

Kate: where are these projects in relation to those funded last year?

Julie pointed out the proximity, and that 2 of the projects received SRFB funds last year.

Joe K: where is the Zinn property in relation to the Buttermilk Bridge?

Julie: really close.

Marc D: grant is to buy all of these if everyone agrees to the appraisal value? What would you do if not everyone decides to sell assuming you would get all the money?

Julie: we have other projects we would be interested in pursuing if that happens.

Marc: include that in your final proposal. Since you are proposing a reach scale easement, it is better to have more sites available.

Tracy: Protection is very important for preventing decreases in habitat condition and species status but protection through this process is getting more expensive and the cost to protect everything everywhere would be immense. Instead of buying up conservation easements, would it work better to integrate in the County planning process to affect change and build in long-term protection?

Julie: the mission of the Conservancy does not involve active political involvement, but our ED is directly involved in those processes to engage in local land use planning.

Casey: the tables were very effective at helping to quantify the various aspects of these projects. Confused about difference between 100 yr floodplain and NWI wetlands. In the past we have generally used the FEMA map as to what is in and out for riparian / floodplain. Either clarify the NWI in the narrative or add an additional column to include the FEMA.

John A: riparian area on Coon property, you could subdivide this property and save quite a bit of money on this property.

Julie: they are donating the easement, so we are only asking for \$20k on this property to complete the administrative process.

Kate: is the Buckley site part of that chain of lakes project?

Julie: yes it was.

9. Twisp River Conservation Acquisition II (MSRF) Presented by Chris Johnson.

Joe K: any houses on the two green squares on the map?

Chris: there are not.

Tracy: you are looking at 13.27 acres for about .5M, which is more than 3 fold more expensive than the easements in this watershed? Why is this a more expensive option?

Chris: the short answer is that conservation easements retain some development rights. This option does not. If the SRFB or Trib Committee feels it is worth less than what we are asking for, then we will work with that and come up with alternatives for how to fill the gap.

Kate: what happens to the structures on the property now?

Chris: the double-wide will be removed as a condition of the purchase.

Kate: So one house is still in the cost of the purchase?

Chris: Yes

John A: it will be important for you to break that out separately.

Michelle K: what about the riprap and dikes?

Chris: it is not included in the cost. We would propose to remove the riprap and dikes through existing funding.

John A: is it possible to include the cost of the home?

Chris: we could and include that in the final proposals.

Ken B: these are willing landowners?

Chris: we have commitments from the landowners at this point, verbal from Doran.

10. Poorman Cr barrier removal (MSRF): Presented by Gregg Knot and Jenny Molesworth.

Carmen: are there any other barriers after the upper USFS barrier is replaced?

Greg: no.

Jen: the FS replaced an upper barrier some years ago, and after this summer that will be it.

Ken B: have you looked at engaging the WDFW pump screen project on this?

Greg: that would be a good idea. We want to go that way and get a screen from that program. We talked about a modular screen in the proposal. This will change because the landowners do not want to inherit any maintenance. Current thinking is a rock structure to check the water and eliminate the tarp diversion.

Jen M: the main benefit will be to steelhead. There is a possibility for spring Chinook rearing, but I have not seen any data to support that. The downstream movement of material will help recruit wood to the Twisp and support habitat conditions there.

Chris: specifically left out the irrigation efficiencies and water flows in this project. But, we are engaging with the landowner in those issues so that we can ready the stream for that later. It needs to be phased or this portion will be held up.

Casey: what is the base flow?

Jen M: it gets down to about 1cfs through the diversions. That is why in the next phase we will work with the irrigators on efficiencies.

Greg: when we started talking to the irrigation district about water rights and moving diversions, etc., it became apparent that it was going to take awhile. We are looking at the water right currently. It may end up being a claim.

Someone: For steelhead, there can still be benefit as long as access is provided in the late winter through early summer and there is perennial flow above the diversions.

Jen: there definitely is perennial flow above the diversions

Kate: in the budget, you have replacement of steel pipe for \$240k?

Chris: that is a typo. It will likely be around \$25k.

Tracy: 2.5 miles above the culvert. Is that still available or is it less when it dewater?

Greg: that is still available. It dewater from the lower diversion to the mouth, which is a relatively short stretch.

Casey: how was the 2.5 miles determined?

Jen: past surveys of O. mykiss and basic habitat conditions that are thought to be suitable for steelhead spawning and rearing.

Michelle: can the FS access their property on the county road? Could the upper culvert be eliminated?

Jen: the road to the left is a private road. The county road is the road that gets to the FS.

Joe K: is that creek dewatered just in the summer?

Greg: depends on the flows, but typically late in the summer.

John A: is there a contribution from the County?

Chris: guardrails and traffic flow.

11. Moody Canyon Engineered Log Jam (CCD): Presented by Tom Gibbons

Chuck: will you have detailed budget information in the final application?

Tom: the budget covers salaries and benefits.

Kate: its not possible to tell what tasks are being conducted with the lump sum for salaries and the % going towards salaries seems high for a project of this type.

Tom provided some detail and agreed to have more details in the final proposal.

Marc D pointed out that salaries (including overhead) can be no more than 30%.

Tracy: where are you getting your logs and what logs are you going to use?

Rich: Bob Whitehall supplies many of them through post fire salvage. They will be conifers.

Carmen: question on monitoring. Like to see more detail about if / how ISEMP will be evaluating them for effectiveness.

Phil: USFWS snorklers work under the ISEMP project seasonally before and post project, as well at control sites.

Carmen: are they also measuring habitat features?

Phil: yes. The snorkel surveys are good at catching resident juvenile and adult presence. We do thorough spawning ground surveys in the Entiat.

Rich: ISEMP conducts the habitat surveys for a variety of things. They are already set up to do this section this summer and again next summer after implementation.

Carmen: might want to elaborate on that in the final application on how you are using those existing activities.

Casey: do you have a life expectancy for these projects?

Tom: Entiat just came up to 3400cfs recently. All the structures that were recently placed in the system are still in place.

Casey: that is fine, but your final proposal should include details about the objectives for these specific structures. It should be in terms of years (i.e. our objective is for it to last x number of years), flow levels (i.e. resist the 100 year flood), etc.

Steve H: Is there an evaluation report on any of the previous projects that have received funding?

Rich: the oldest structures have had habitat surveys on them since 2001. These do have reports coming in regularly. (These are the cross-vane demonstration projects at the Firehouse and bridge).

Casey: an important part of the implementation structure for the recovery plan is to provide adaptive management feedback loops in the form of analysis workshops and a report card.

John A: looking back at how the LWD versus rock projects went last year in the Entiat, provide as much detail as you can in the final proposal that addresses the importance of any particular structure.

12. Middle Stillwater Design Only (CCD) Presented by Tom Gibbons

Casey offered clarification on the major spawning area designations and asked for clarification on the new information on major and minor spawning areas in the lower river (16 miles).

Phil: the regional forest has conducted routine sampling over the last 5 years. We now have enough information to suggest that the lower 16 miles has a substantial amount of steelhead spawning.

Casey: suggested wording, “The Entiat River is a major spawning area for spring Chinook and steelhead” or if referring to a particular area within the subbasin... “the Upper (or Lower) Entiat is part of a major spawning area for spring Chinook and steelhead”.

Joe M: any permitting needed for this design work?

Tom G: yes when we go from the 30% level to the 100% level design.

Kate: It is recommended that the CCD to provide more detail in to the budget. I would like to see the Trib Fund and SRFB Budget together. An itemized budget would assist in understanding such a large funding request since the assessment work and review is being provided in a cost share. In the budget it would be help to have the CCD services itemized as well.

Tracy: will this be monitored under the ISEMP program?

Rich: it is already being monitored under ISEMP.

Tracy: using total station and ISEMP transects, there is a good opportunity to validate and test for bias in current monitoring protocols. It would be good to include this in the final proposal.

Carmen: on p3, the current situation seems to have inconsistent wording with respect to limiting factors. You use this in your other applications about development in Stillwater is increasing and impacted habitat, but that it is in good condition. You might want to work on clarifying this in the final application. The LWD will add complexity, but we need to understand where the sediment is coming from. Is it coming from within the reach or the upper watershed?

Phil: Sediment levels are lower above the reach, suggesting that it's not coming from the upper watershed. Sediment transports are event driven and this is a depositional reach.

Carmen: not disagreeing with what you are saying. That just supports my thoughts about this project, and that the scope of this assessment needs to be much broader.

Tom K: can you tie this up for us and link it to the other proposals for assessments?

Mike presented something to us this morning, now the Stillwater, plus the work that Rick Woodsmith did and the USBR has done in the lower river. Tie this together to help us understand how these all work together.

Steve K: the reason Stillwater gets attention is because there are people interested in doing projects. The proposed assessments will not duplicate one another. This was the most expedient way to get projects on the ground.

Tom K: it would be useful to articulate that somehow in the final applications.

Michelle: on the Moody Canyon project, you aren't going to that level of detail as you are with this project. Why?

Tom G: in the lower Entiat, the assessments currently completed there are acceptable. The upper Entiat is currently changing at 2-3 x natural rate (via Woodsmith and Bookter 2007). We want to get the background information to be sure that we understand the implications of any particular action.

It would be helpful to provide a full reference and weblink to the Woodsmith and Bookter 2007 report.

13. Keystone Diversion (CCD) Presented by Tom Gibbons

Casey: most of the questions/comments from the Moody Canyon proposal will apply to this project as well.

Patty: why are these separate projects? Seems as though this will be duplicative.

Tom: these are two different designs. They are presented separately so that they both have a higher probability of getting funded.

Rich: would you like to see them submitted as one project with a split budget?

Steve: we have one AER for both projects. We have one design for both projects.

Several people agreed that it would make sense to combine them and that would lead to efficiencies in implementation, budget, and perhaps minimize disturbance during implementation.

Steve K: one thing that might be helpful for the project sponsor is whether there is a line item veto capacity for the SRFB.

Casey: the RTT is going to discuss the technical merits of the project(s) and the funding sources will get into the desires for funding particular elements of a project if they decided to partially fund it.

Carmen: seen as a whole, these are good projects. Looking at these on technical merits, I would not recommend pulling out these particular elements of the project.

Joy: The citizens committee will have a chance to review it and comment / prioritize based on scope and budget.

Marc D: you'll get feedback from the Review Panel that is technically relevant. After the September 8 submittal date, you'll get feedback on the merits of the project, whether it is good or not.

15:45 Wrap up, next steps (Baldwin)

The USFWS habitat project was pulled from consideration.

Casey thanked all the presenters and the RTT / Trib Committee members and others in attendance for their review and comments. Next steps include circulation of the meeting notes by June 20, so that project sponsors will have them before the project tours.

Roy Beaty asked for a few minutes to talk with the group about implementation of BPA's MOA with the Yakima Nation. His questions included:

- 1) How aware is this group of the specific actions that BPA has been funding?
It appears to Roy that BPA's funding is most apparent as cost-share in the project-specific proposals from project sponsors.
-Answer-Its not very clear when and where BPA funding has fit into this regional process. Derek-BPA funding has been a separate process that was not directly linked to other funding processes
- 2) Are there preferences or policies in place regarding acquisition versus easement?
-Answer-Nothing formal, and from a technical perspective it should not make a big difference as long as the stewardship plan of the easement is adequate and complied with. However, the UCSRB prefers easements so that the property does not leave the tax base.

How about divestment (e.g., sale) of uplands or other portions of properties that have relatively low conservation value, then returning the proceeds to the program?

-Answer: Depends on the sponsor, the landowner's wishes, etc., but there is no policy or preference.

Scoring the potential biological benefits of proposals so that they could be compared to project costs and used to evaluate the relative "value" of proposed projects?

- Answer: The RTT does not incorporate a cost benefit analysis in their scoring. They comment on technical aspects of the budget and incorporate that into their "certainty of success criteria". In the SRFB process, the Citizens' Board does evaluate overall cost and can shift the priority of a project based on costs.

3) Are you seeing any evidence that the demand for conservation property may be affecting the prices of the properties available in some locales? Alternatively, are you seeing any signs that the "market" of willing landowners is becoming saturated, such that the proposals are becoming more marginal? (Roy assumed not)

- Answer: Property values are escalating rapidly on their own (e.g., in the Methow), and it is unlikely that conservation-related acquisitions are adding noticeably to that trend.

4) Can you identify any specific ways that a greater and more focused BPA staff presence in the Upper Columbia might facilitate the progress of conservation/restoration work? This is beginning to be discussed at low echelons in BPA, and Roy would appreciate your input at any time.

16:00 adjourn

RTT members present: Casey Baldwin, John Arterburn, Russell Langshaw, Chuck Peven, Kate Terrell, Tom Kahler, Steve Hays, Carmen Andonaegui, Tracy Hillman, Joe Kelly, Keely Murdoch.

Others Present: Derek Van Marter, Michelle Cramer, Patty Michak, Roy Beaty, Marc Duboiski, Steve Kolk, Mark Indrebo, Joy Juelson, Mike Rickel, Joe Miller, Becky Gallaher, Keith Truscott, Martin Fisher, Char Beam, Kathy Bangs, Alan Schmidt, Ken Bevis, Julie Grialou, Chris Johnson, Greg Knott, Phil Archibald, Rich Malinowski, Tom Gibbons.